

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending, and rejected claims 1-13. No claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claim has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-13 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

THE APPLICATION

The application describes a communication between a switched-circuit network and at least two Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) domains and a gateway located in between. To limit the number of gateways devices dependent on the number of VoIP domains, a registration request message is sent from the gateway device to the signaling controllers located in each of the VoIP domain. In response to the registration request message, the gateway device is simultaneously registered in each of the VoIP domains, thereby, limiting the number of gateway devices (see specification, paragraphs [0010]-[0012]).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ravindranath et al. (USPN 6,987,756) (hereinafter "Ravindranath").

Ravindranath is related to a multi-mode endpoint in a communication network system that allows an endpoint (e.g. telephones) to be simultaneously registered with more than one communication server (see Ravindranath, Abstract).

However, in claim 1 of the application **the gateway device**, "connected between the switched-circuit communication network and the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains", is **"simultaneously register[ed] ... in the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains as a Voice over Internet Protocol termination point"**. Ravindranath does not disclose such a feature since Ravindranath describes a telephony network system including a gateway coupled to the network cloud (see Ravindranath, col. 5, lines 31-35). Particularly, the gateway includes a gatekeeper function to provide registration for telephone calls therebetween (see Ravindranath, col. 5, lines 45-50).

Further, Ravindranath describes that an endpoint (e.g. the telephone) is coupled to a terminal gateway by way of a communication link. The terminal gateway is coupled to the

network cloud via communication link (see Ravindranath, col. 4, lines 4-5 and lines 12-16). As a result, an endpoint (e.g. telephone) is allowed to be simultaneously registered with one or more communication servers (see Ravindranath, col. 2, lines 41-44 and col. 6, lines 8-13). In claim 1, however, the gateway is "simultaneously register[ed] ... in the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains". Ravindranath does not disclose this feature because Ravindranath describes registering an endpoint (e.g. telephone) in the communication servers and does not describe registering a gateway device in the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Ravindranath.

Claims 6 and 10 recite "simultaneous registration of the gateway device in each of the (or said) Voice over Internet Protocol network domains as a Voice over Internet Protocol end point". It is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 10 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims 2-5, 7-9 and 11-13 are also patentable over Ravindranath for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13 are further patentable over Ravindranath for the reasons discussed below.

With respect to claim 2, Fig. 5 of Ravindranath describes that while endpoints A and B are connected to each other, endpoint C can dial the telephone number of endpoint B causing terminal gateway C to forward the telephone number to telephony server 1 (see Ravindranath, col. 11, lines 52-53 and lines 65-67). The telephony server, using the MAC and IP address of terminal gateway B in its table, sends a ring message to endpoint B. Terminal gateway B provides a ring signal or call waiting "beep" signal to endpoint B. **At substantially the same time**, telephony server sends a ringback message to terminal gateway C, which generates a ringback signal to the endpoint C (see Ravindranath, col. 12, lines 1-9). In claim 2 of the present invention, however, "the registration request messages are transferred **in parallel** to the signaling controller in each of the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains". It is respectfully submitted that sending a ringback message at substantially the same time, as described in Ravindranath, does not constitute "registration request messages ... transferred in parallel" as recited in claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Ravindranath for this additional reason.

In claim 3, "by broadcasting from the gateway device a request message into the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains" the network address of the signal controller in each of the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains is determined. This feature is not disclosed in

Ravindranath since Ravindranath describes the telephony server using the MAC and IP address of terminal gateway B in its table to send a ring message to an end point (see Ravindranath, col. 12, lines 1-5). As a result, in Ravindranath, no broadcasting occurs, rather, a ring message is sent based upon the MAC and IP address stored in the telephony server's table. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over Ravindranath.

Claims 7 and 11 recite "broadcasting an address resolution request message into the (said) Voice over Internet Protocol network domains" where the parenthetical are used in claim 11 in place of the words preceding the parenthetical. It is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 11 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 3.

In claim 5, the gateway device "evaluat[es] the destination address information; and determin[es] ... a choice relating to further connection setup between the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains. This feature is not taught in Ravindranath since Fig. 1 of Ravindranath describes the telephony server searching for the MAC and IP address of terminal gateway B in its table and sends the ring message to endpoint B (see Ravindranath, col. 12, lines 1-5). Therefore, Ravindranath does not describe the gateway device evaluating and determining, but rather describes the telephony server searching and sending based upon the telephony server's table storing the MAC and IP address of the terminal gateway. Thus, claim 5 is patentable over Ravindranath.

Claims 9 and 13 recite that the gateway device is used to "evaluate the destination address information and to make a selection affecting further connection setup between the (or said) Voice over Internet Protocol network domains based on evaluation of the destination address information". It is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 13 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 5.

SCHEDULED INTERVIEW

The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for scheduling an Interview on January 17, 2008, to further discuss the distinctions between the invention and Ravindranath, as well as whether an amendment of the claims is needed to clarify those differences.

SUMMARY

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or

Serial No. 10/655,583

rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 10, 2008

By: 
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501